```
Robert E. Thompson, Esq.
 1
    110 Sutter Street, Suite 501
 2
    San Francisco, California 94104
    California State Bar No. 93022
 3
    Telephone:
                (415)
                       543-2818
                (415)
                       788-6144
    Facsimile:
 4
    Attorney for Plaintiff
 5
    Gabrielle Lema
                         UNTIED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 6
 7
                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 8
                               SAN JOSE DIVISION
 9
10
    GABRIELLE LEMA,
                                        CASE NO. C07-03631 JF
11
12
                   Plaintiff,
                                        MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
                                        AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
13
                                        FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT
14
                                        Hearing Date:
                                                        December 21, 2007
              v.
                                                        9:00 AM
15
                                        Hearing Time:
                                        Courtroom:
                                                        3
16
    SIRVA/NAL WORLDWIDE LOGISTICS,)
    ET AL.,
17
                                        Before the Honorable United States
                   Defendants.
                                        District Court Judge Jeremy Fogel
18
19
20
         Plaintiff Gabrielle Lema, through her undersigned attorney of
21
    record, respectfully submits the following memorandum in support of her
22
    motion for leave to amend her complaint:
23
    I.
         PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND
24
         On April 23, 2007, following her receipt of a "Right To Sue"
25
    letter, plaintiff caused the filing of a Complaint For Damages, as a
26
    Pro Per plaintiff, in the Superior Court for the State of California,
27
    County of Alameda, Case Number G 07322091. Plaintiff, in Pro Per, filed
```

an amendment to the State Court complaint on May 30, 2007. Thereafter,

28

On July 13, 2007, defendants Sirva/Nal Worldwide Logistics, Sirva, Inc., Joe Jenio, Scott Black, Ken Whelan, and Ramon Padilla, filed and joined in a Notice of Removal, respectively.

On July 17, 2007, Sirva/Nal Worldwide Logistics, Sirva, Inc., Nal Worldwide, LLC, Juan Cortes, Joe Jenio, Scott Black, Ken Whelan, Marilyn Beardsley, Ramon Padilla, for filed their joint Answer to the Complaint For Damages.

On August 13, 2007, plaintiff in Pro Per, filed an Opposition and Rebuttal to Defendant's Notice of Removal of Civil Action.

On September 4, 2007, undersigned counsel entered appearance to represent plaintiff in this action.

This action is scheduled for Case Management Conference on November 30, 2007, and Mediation on December 13, 2007. Plaintiff submits that she will be unduly prejudiced if she cannot pursue her complete action pursuant to the desired amended complaint.

## II. PARTIES

At relevant times to plaintiff's injuries, she was employed by Sirva/Nal Worldwide Logistics, Sirva, Inc. And/or Nal Worldwide, LLC. Plaintiff's initial complaint named "Sirva/Nal Worldwide Logistics" as a defendant. It appears that the proper company may be Sirva, Inc.

Defendants Juan Cortes, Joe Jenio, Scott Black, Ken Whelan, Marilyn Beardsley, Ramon Padilla, were supervisors, officers and/or co-workers for plaintiff and plaintiff believes that each has participated in the wrongdoing which contributed to her harassment, injuries, damages. Of these named individual defendants, all have participated in this action except Juan Cortes, and Marilyn Beardsley, who have not yet been served with process.

## III. ARGUMENT

The court may grant leave to amend the pleadings at any stage of the action. Granting or denial of leave to amend rests in the sound discretion of the trial court. Swanson v. United States Forest Service (9th Cir. 1996) 87 F3d 339, 343. The Federal Rules require that "leave shall be freely given when justice so requires." Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 15(a).

The Court's granting of this motion for leave to amend the complaint will cause prejudice to the parties before the Court. See, Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose (9th Cir. 1990) 893 F2d 1074, 1079.

## III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in the interest of justice, plaintiff submits that the court should grant her leave to file her Amended Complaint.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT

/s/

Gabrielle Lema